Appl. No. 09/931,391
Amdt. dated October 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2004

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-11 have been amended. Claims 12-17 have been added. Support for new claims 12-17 can be found in the specification, specifically page 21 and Figure 17. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11 now comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101. (See In re Beauregard, 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1995); MPEP 2106). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In addition, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application publication 2002/0054046 to Evans et al. ("Evans"). Applicants respectfully submit that Evans does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the present invention as recited in the amended claims. For example, claim 1 recites, in part, "... code for a programming environment configured to render a plurality of areas of an user interface component from a shared delegation object, the plurality of areas includes at least one corner area, at least one border area, and at least one background area; ... wherein a first image is used to render the at least one background area, a second image is used to render the at least one border area, a third image is used to render the at least one corner area." Nowhere does Evans discuss this claimed combination for rendering an user interface component. In fact, Evans simply uses image files 232 (presumably as those shown in Fig. 3 of Evans) for a business theme. (Evans: col. 8, para. [0076]). Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowed for at least this reason. Claims 1-6 and 12-17, which depend from claim 1, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 1, as well as the additional features they recite. For example, claims 12-16 recited that images files are tiled. Nowhere does Evans teach or suggest this feature as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Evans does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the present invention as recited in independent claim 7. Claim 7 recites, in part, "... wherein the user interface component is rendered by a plurality of tiled images." Evans does not teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, claim 7 should be allowed for at least this reason.

Appl. No. 09/931,391
Amdt. dated October 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2004

PATENT

Claims 8-11, which depend from claim 7, should be allowed for at least a similar reason, as well as the additional features they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

Tyrome Y. Brown
Reg. No. 46,580

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
TYB:asb
60319438 v1